

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs

A. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) in Years One-Six

1. The APR and EPR are the primary means for ensuring that an NTTF is performing well; therefore, it is important that the progress is steady and consistent with criteria and standards for performance as detailed in Section A and promotion as detailed in Section D. Unless the department chair has approved and the dean has endorsed an alternate allocation, NTTF HESA faculty members have the following workload allocation: 80% teaching and 20% service. If the assigned workload includes program coordination, or other expectations, evidence of productivity in the assigned area must be included in the portfolio.
2. NTTF shall obtain and maintain regular graduate faculty status (Level II privileges) as soon as they are eligible to do so and provide a copy of the letter from Graduate College sent when current graduate faculty status was awarded.
3. Teaching
 - a. Teaching effectiveness by faculty members is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the university. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for reappointment. Faculty members shall contribute positively to student learning. Participation in programs to develop teaching talent is encouraged.
 - b. A typical NTTF teaching load in HESA is four courses both fall and spring semesters. Active participation on preliminary examination and dissertation committees may be considered as part of the teaching load. In their teaching narrative, faculty should discuss their roles in these activities as part of their overall teaching responsibilities.
 - c. In years one and two, NTTF shall have at least one peer evaluation of teaching both fall and spring semester. In years 3-6, NTTF shall have at least one peer evaluation of teaching each year. Peer evaluations of teaching shall be deemed positive if they provide evidence that the faculty member is an effective teacher. Prior to the EPR, at least 2 peer evaluations of teaching should come from a tenured HESA faculty member and at least one from a tenured faculty member or NTTF at a higher rank from outside of HESA. The HESA department chair shall collaborate with the NTTF to identify peer reviewers. Reviewers should attend at least half the class session for 3-credit courses meeting once a week or a full class session for courses meeting two or three times per week. The candidate shall provide the course syllabus, lesson plan, and any assigned readings for the class session to the reviewer and the reviewer should have an opportunity to talk with students without the faculty member present. Reviewers shall be asked to evaluate overall teaching effectiveness (e.g., course structure, classroom management, teaching strategies, advancement of course

learning objectives), meet with the faculty member to review the feedback, and submit this letter to the department chair who will provide the faculty member with a copy. These letters are required performance indicators that must be included in the dossier submitted for APR or EPR, as appropriate.

- d. Student course evaluations of teaching provide another indication of the extent to which the faculty member is an effective teacher and that no persistent problems are evident. If any problems were identified in prior student and/or peer evaluations, evidence that they have been addressed and improved upon shall be provided. All course means on the student evaluations for the period under review shall be averaged to calculate an overall mean score. One indicator of teaching effectiveness is an overall mean > 3.75 on a 5-point scale along with generally positive qualitative comments (i.e., preponderance of positive comments and absence of persistent and significant concerns). Faculty members shall employ strategies to ensure at least an 80% response rate (indicated on course evaluation report) on course evaluations (e.g., devote class time to complete evaluations). Faculty members shall provide all course evaluation reports for the period under review. These reports include both quantitative and qualitative data. They shall also provide a table listing all courses taught by the faculty member that includes: (a) semester of course, (b) course title, (c) evaluation response rate, (d) course mean, (e) course standard deviation, (f) department mean, and (g) department standard deviation.
- e. NTTF shall serve on preliminary examination and dissertation committees chaired by other faculty members when asked by doctoral students and when their committee load can accommodate the student. By Year 2, NTTF should serve on 2-3 committees if they have been asked to do so. Beyond Year 2, committee loads will vary but adding 2-3 committee roles per year (when asked) is desirable. Committee members shall provide timely feedback to students to aid in students' progress toward degree completion. NTTF shall provide a chart to show the student committees on which they serve and the dates at which students passed program milestones and describe their roles in working with students in their teaching narrative.

Preliminary Exam and Dissertation Committees			
Student Name	Date of Preliminary Exam Defense	Date of Proposal Defense	Date of Dissertation Defense

- f. Faculty members shall maintain an assigned advising load of M.A. students. Advisors shall provide guidance in course selection, internship performance, professional development, academic progress, etc. The annual number of advisees shall be included on the CV and a description of advising activities shall be included in the teaching narrative or in a teaching artifact.

- g. Other indicators may include, but are not limited to, mid-semester course evaluations, course syllabi, sample assignments, feedback on student assignments (with student information redacted), creation of new classes, service on thesis committees, contributions to curriculum development, and teaching awards. The faculty member shall explain how these indicators demonstrate effective teaching (e.g., syllabus meets provost's guidelines including clear statements of course expectations, etc., sample assignment well designed to meet learning outcomes).
- h. For the EPR, faculty members shall provide a 3-5 page teaching narrative in which they articulate a clearly defined philosophy of teaching and provide a reflective analysis of the artifacts included in the dossier. They should clearly explain how they have met stated criteria and standards and how the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) illustrate teaching effectiveness. For teaching, peer evaluations of teaching (Section A.3.c.) and student course evaluations (Section A.3.d.) are required performance indicators. Faculty shall also provide two or three additional performance indicators as detailed in Section A.3.g. as well as the information required in Sections A.3.e-f.

4. Service

- a. Service contributions by NTTF to the department, college, university, and profession are critical to the overall mission of the University. In presenting their records of service, NTTF shall include documentation (e.g., reports authored, letter of support from committee chair) that provides evidence of productive activities and contributions that indicate success on the performance indicators used for evaluation. Examples of service include editorial activities (i.e., editing and/or reviewing the work of others) for professional books, journals, newsletters, conferences, or grants; consultantships and speaking engagements related to the profession; contributions to department, college, university, or professional committees as member or leader; student group advising; service awards or citations; and professional publications or conference presentations.
- b. Faculty members shall perform service, by either assignment, election, or nomination every year. Annual service on at least one department committee *and* at least one college or university committee are required for all NTTF. Annual service to the profession (e.g., conference proposal reviewer, service on a committee) in years one and two is desired but not required. At least one service commitment to the profession every other year on average after the EPR is expected (e.g., committee service, leadership role, proposal reviewer, journal manuscript reviewer [ad hoc or editorial board]).
- c. External community service (e.g., to support community organizations, projects, and programs) relevant to a faculty member's teaching is valued but not required. With a written agreement from the department chair and endorsement of the dean, external community service related to the discipline may substitute for college or university service.
- d. For the EPR, faculty members shall provide a 3-5 page service narrative in which they provide a reflective analysis of the artifacts included in the dossier. They should

clearly explain how—appropriate to their level—they have met stated criteria and standards and how the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) illustrate how they have made substantive contributions to the department, college, university, and the profession. They shall provide at least four and no more than five performance indicators as detailed in Sections A.4.a-c.

5. The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost and Dean's Office.

B. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF APR and EPR Materials

1. For each required APR, NTTF shall submit (1) a curriculum vitae (CV) in the BGSU format with activities for the period under review highlighted, (2) teaching and service narratives that explain how criteria and standards detailed in Section A have been met, (3) a peer evaluation of teaching, and (4) all student course evaluations for the period under review. An electronic copy of these materials shall be submitted to the department chair.
2. For the EPR, NTTF shall submit (1) a CV in the BGSU format with activities for the period under review highlighted, (2) Parts I and II of the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy, and (3) all narratives and performance indicators detailed in Section A. Faculty members shall upload all required materials into the designated submission system in accordance with the university's schedule on or before a date specified by the department chair.
3. All submitted materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors.

C. Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

Prior to the department chair conducting an APR, the eligible voting faculty members shall evaluate the NTTF's progress in assigned duties and submit a review letter to the department chair. The chair will provide a copy of this letter to the faculty member and address any areas of disagreement if they exist in the chair's letter. The chair's letter shall be submitted to the dean.

D. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

1. Appointment as or promotion to lecturer requires demonstrated achievement in teaching and service. Appointment as or promotion to senior lecturer requires a cumulative record of sustained teaching effectiveness and sustained and substantial service contributions within and external to BGSU.
2. The following criteria and standards shall be used to evaluate achievement in teaching and service. For promotion to lecturer, the primary focus of evaluation shall be on the period since the most recent appointment as instructor, with particular emphasis on the prior six-year period. For promotion to senior lecturer, the primary focus of evaluation shall be on the period since the most recent appointment as lecturer, with particular emphasis on the prior six-year period.

3. Criteria and Standards for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

- a. Typically shall have a minimum of six years' experience as an instructor and/or relevant college teaching and/or professional experience.
- b. If currently employed at BGSU, shall have regular graduate faculty status (Level II). If initially hired at this rank, shall be eligible for provisional or regular graduate faculty status (Level II). The Graduate College requires at least two separate pieces of peer reviewed academic work or the equivalent during the previous six years of this reappointment (e.g., professional publication or conference presentation).
- c. Teaching and service narratives in which faculty members (1) effectively describe how they satisfy the criteria and standards detailed in Section A, (2) provide necessary context for the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) they provide for review, (3) explicitly address any concerns expressed in previous APRs and EPRs, and (4) provide documentation of strong performance or a pattern of improvement over the review period.
- d. Shall have an established reputation as an effective teacher (depending on assigned duties).
- e. If currently employed at BGSU, shall provide evidence of active involvement in service to the department, college, university, and/or profession (depending on assigned duties). If initially hired at this rank, shall give evidence of potential contributions to the department, college, university, and/or profession.
- f. Criteria used for promotion to lecturer include a successful evaluation of all criteria detailed in Section A for EPR of NTTF with the following modifications:
 - (1) Student course evaluations as an instructor document quantitative mean scores of at least 3.75 on a 5-point scale.
 - (2) At least three peer evaluations from senior lecturers or tenured faculty since appointment as instructor, two of which are from the prior three years. These peer evaluations shall be deemed generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns).
 - (3) Documentation of at least two leadership positions in teaching and/or service
 - (a) Leadership in teaching that will be considered for promotion to lecturer may include:
 - Participation on at least six doctoral committees in which the preliminary examination has been completed, the dissertation proposal has been approved, and/or the dissertation defense has occurred.
 - Creation and/or significant revision of a course or program, including obtaining all necessary approvals across University committees.
 - Leading a learning community with an explicit focus on teaching for faculty within the College or across the University.

- Publication and/or dissemination (i.e., beyond the faculty member's assigned course) of instructional materials for use by other instructors at the university level.
 - Professional publications or presentations related to teaching.
 - Teaching award from university or professional organization.
 - Other evidence of leadership in teaching as appropriate and explained in the teaching narrative.
- (b) Leadership in service that will be considered for promotion to lecturer may include:
- Chairing a committee at the school, college, or university level.
 - Chairing a committee or holding an elected office in a local, regional, state, or national/international professional association within the faculty member's field of expertise.
 - Service award from university or professional organization.
 - Other evidence of leadership in service as appropriate and explained in the service narrative.

4. Criteria and Standards for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

- a. Typically shall have a minimum of six years' experience as a lecturer and/or relevant college teaching and/or professional experience. The primary focus of evaluation shall be on the time period since promotion to lecturer.
- b. If currently employed at BGSU, shall have regular graduate faculty status (Level II). If initially hired at this rank, shall be eligible for provisional or regular graduate faculty status (Level II). The Graduate College requires at least two separate pieces of peer reviewed academic work or the equivalent during the previous six years of this reappointment (e.g., professional publication or conference presentation).
- c. Teaching and service narratives in which faculty members (1) effectively describe how they satisfy the criteria and standards detailed in Section A, (2) provide necessary context for the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) they provide for review, (3) explicitly address any concerns expressed in previous APRs and EPRs, and (4) provide documentation of strong performance or a pattern of improvement over the review period.
- d. Shall have an established reputation as an effective teacher (depending on assigned duties).
- e. If currently employed at BGSU, shall provide evidence of active involvement in service to the department, college, university, and/or profession (depending on assigned duties). If initially hired at this rank, shall give evidence of potential contributions to the department, college, university, and/or profession.

- f. Criteria used for promotion to senior lecturer include a successful evaluation of all criteria detailed in Section A for EPR of NTTF with the following modifications:
- (1) Student course evaluations as a lecturer document quantitative mean scores of at least 4.00 on a 5-point scale.
 - (2) At least three peer evaluations from senior lecturers or tenured faculty since appointment as lecturer, two of which are from the prior three years. These peer evaluations shall be deemed generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns).
 - (3) Documentation of at least four leadership positions including at least one in both teaching and/or service as a lecturer.
 - (a) Leadership in teaching that will be considered for promotion to senior lecturer may include:
 - Participation on at least six doctoral committees in which the preliminary examination has been completed, the dissertation proposal has been approved, and/or the dissertation defense has occurred.
 - Creation/significant revision of a course or program, including obtaining all necessary approvals across University committees.
 - Leading a learning community with an explicit focus on teaching for faculty within the College or across the University.
 - Publication and/or dissemination (i.e., beyond the faculty member's assigned course) of instructional materials for use by other instructors at the university level.
 - Professional publications or presentations related to teaching.
 - Teaching award from university or professional organization.
 - Other evidence of leadership in teaching as appropriate and explained in the teaching narrative.
 - (b) Leadership in service that will be considered for promotion to senior lecturer may include:
 - Chairing a committee at the school, college, or university levels.
 - Chairing a committee or holding an elected office in a state or national/international professional association within the faculty member's field of expertise.
 - Service award from university or professional organization.
 - Other evidence of leadership in service as appropriate and explained in the service narrative.

E. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

1. NTTF members who are candidates for promotion to lecturer or senior lecturer shall meet with the department chair to review relevant policies and procedures. Faculty members are also encouraged to attend promotion workshops sponsored by the college and to seek assistance in preparing the materials from the faculty mentor, department chair, and other faculty members prior to submission into the designated submission system.
2. Faculty members shall submit materials electronically into the designated submission system in accordance with the university's schedule on or before a date specified by the department chair.
3. Materials for promotion uploaded into the system shall include:
 - a. Parts I and II of the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy (or appropriate document)
 - b. CV in the BGSU format with all activities for the period under review highlighted (i.e., since initial appointment or since last promotion)
 - c. Copy of letter from Graduate College sent when current graduate faculty status was awarded.
 - d. Narratives for teaching and service and at least four and no more than five supporting performance indicators for both areas; performance indicators shall support the criteria and standards for promotion detailed in Sections A and D of this document.
 - e. For faculty members applying for promotion to lecturer, all prior APRs and EPRs from BGSU; for those applying for promotion to senior lecturer, all APRs or equivalent (i.e., merit report under common review process) since promotion to lecturer.
4. All submitted materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors.
5. The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost and Dean's Office

F. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of TTF

1. The APR and EPR are the primary means for ensuring that a TTF is making sufficient progress toward tenure and promotion; therefore, it is important that the progress is steady over the entire probationary period and consistent with criteria and standards for tenure and promotion outlined in Sections F and I. Unless the department chair has approved and the dean has endorsed an alternate allocation, HESA faculty members have the following workload allocation: 40% teaching, 40% research/scholarship, 20% service.
2. Faculty members shall obtain and maintain regular graduate faculty status (Level I or II) as soon as they are eligible to do so and provide a copy of the letter from Graduate College sent when current graduate faculty status was awarded.

3. Teaching

- a. Teaching effectiveness by faculty members is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the university. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. Faculty members shall contribute positively to student learning, especially those students enrolled in M.A. and Ph.D. courses in the department. Participation in programs to develop one's teaching talent is encouraged.
- b. A typical teaching load in HESA is two graduate courses both fall and spring semesters. In addition to these courses, all HESA faculty members advise M.A. and Ph.D. students and serve on preliminary examination and dissertation committees. Faculty should discuss their roles in these activities as part of their overall teaching responsibilities.
- c. Tenure-track faculty members shall have at least one peer evaluation of teaching each year. Peer evaluations of teaching shall be deemed positive if they provide evidence that the faculty member is an effective teacher. At least 50% of peer reviews should be conducted by HESA faculty members but prior to the application for promotion and tenure, at least one should come from outside of HESA. Prior to the EPR, faculty members shall have at least 2 peer evaluations of teaching. Peer reviewers should be tenured faculty members. The HESA department chair shall collaborate with the faculty member to identify reviewers. Reviewers should attend at least half the class session for 3-credit courses meeting once a week or a full class session for courses meeting 2 or 3 times per week. The candidate shall provide the reviewers with the course syllabus, lesson plan, and any assigned readings for the class session and the reviewer should have an opportunity to talk with students without the faculty member present. Reviewers shall be asked to evaluate overall teaching effectiveness (e.g., course structure, classroom management, teaching strategies, advancement of course learning objectives), meet with the faculty member to review the feedback, and submit this letter to the department chair who will provide the faculty member with a copy.
- d. Student course evaluations of teaching provide another indication of the extent to which the faculty member is an effective teacher and that no persistent problems are evident. If any problems were identified in prior student and/or peer evaluations, evidence that they have been addressed and improved upon shall be provided. All course means on the student evaluations for the period under review shall be averaged to calculate an overall mean score. One indicator of teaching effectiveness is an overall mean > 3.75 on a 5-point scale along with generally positive qualitative comments (i.e., preponderance of positive comments and absence of persistent and significant concerns). Faculty members shall employ strategies to ensure at least an 80% response rate (indicated on course evaluation report) on course evaluations (e.g., devote class time to complete evaluations). Faculty members shall provide all course evaluation reports for the period under review. These reports include both quantitative and qualitative data. They shall also provide a table listing all courses taught by the faculty member that includes: (a) semester of course, (b) course title, (c) evaluation

response rate, (d) course mean, (e) course standard deviation, (f) department mean, and (g) department standard deviation.

- e. In years 1-3 of a tenure-track position, faculty members shall serve on preliminary examination and dissertation committees chaired by other faculty members when asked by doctoral students and when their committee load can accommodate the student. By Year 2, faculty members should serve on 2-3 committees if they have been asked to do so. If they are eligible for graduate faculty status Level I privileges prior to the EPR, they should secure it; they can then serve as advisor to doctoral students. Faculty members shall consult with the chair to ensure they are carrying an appropriate committee load (neither too heavy nor too light) based on student and department needs. After the EPR, faculty members shall also serve as advisor to doctoral students (i.e., chair preliminary examination and dissertation committees) in addition to serving on committees chaired by other faculty members when asked by students and when their advising load can accommodate the student. When departmental resources permit, faculty members typically advise 3-4 students active at the proposal and/or dissertation stage and serve on additional preliminary exam, proposal, and dissertation committees for a total of 9-12 committees, on average. Both committee chairs and members shall provide timely feedback to students to aid in students' progress toward degree completion. Faculty members shall provide a chart to show the student committees for which they are chair or member and the dates at which students passed program milestones and describe their roles in working with students.

Student Name	Role (Chair or Committee member)	Date of Preliminary Exam Defense	Date of Proposal Defense	Date of Dissertation Defense

- f. Faculty members shall maintain an assigned advising load of M.A. students. Advisors shall provide guidance in course selection, internship performance, professional development, academic progress, etc. The annual number of advisees shall be included on the CV and a description of advising activities shall be included in the teaching narrative or in a teaching artifact.
- g. Other indicators of teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to, mid-semester course evaluations, course syllabi, sample assignments, feedback on student assignments (with student information redacted), creation of new classes, service on thesis committees, contributions to curriculum development, and teaching awards. The faculty member shall explain how these indicators demonstrate effective teaching (e.g., syllabus meets provost's guidelines including clear statements of course expectations, etc., sample assignment well designed to meet learning outcomes).

- h. For the EPR, faculty members shall provide a 3-5 page teaching narrative in which they articulate a clearly defined philosophy of teaching and provide a reflective analysis of the artifacts included in the dossier. They should clearly explain how they have met stated criteria and standards and how the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) illustrate teaching effectiveness. For teaching, peer evaluations of teaching (Section F.3.c.) and student course evaluations (Section F.3.d.) are required performance indicators. Faculty shall also provide two or three additional performance indicators as detailed in Section F.3.g. as well as the information required in Sections F.3.e.-f.

4. Research/Scholarship

- a. Making significant and on-going contributions to the knowledge base of the discipline is critical to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Such contributions are important both in their own right, and because they are an essential qualification for instructing others at a university. Thus, achievement in this area is vital to the department's evaluation of faculty members who are undergoing annual review.
- b. The primary evidence of research/scholarly effectiveness is high quality peer reviewed publications. Scholarship shall show evidence of originality and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the publication outlet and the impact of the work on others in the discipline. In considering the quality of publications, the following factors may be taken into account: level of publication outlet (international, national, regional, state), impact (e.g., number of citations), journal acceptance rate, recognition and prestige of publication (e.g., impact factor), and other factors deemed relevant and justified by the faculty member. Additionally, across the body of work, candidates are expected to have published in different journals or outlets. Co-authored publications are equivalent to single author publications but faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of the publication. Documented in press publications are considered published.
- c. Research/scholarly productivity shall be consistent with faculty members' progress toward tenure and promotion (e.g., expectations increase from the first to second year of a probationary appointment). Publications in peer-reviewed journals are especially significant. During the first APR, the faculty member shall, at minimum, show progress toward meeting expectations for scholarship (e.g., submission of conference proposals, HSRB approval for study to collect data, and/or analysis of existing data, or equivalent activities). During the second APR, the faculty member shall, at minimum, have at least one of the following: (a) two refereed journal articles under review, in press, or published; OR (b) one refereed journal article and one of the following publications: unmasked peer reviewed book chapter, monograph or chapter within a monograph (e.g., *New Directions* series), article in academic magazine (e.g., *About Campus*, *Change*) appropriate to the discipline, or peer reviewed book. These publications may be under review, in press, or published. During the EPR, faculty members shall typically have at least two publications (published, in press, or

- accepted pending minor revisions), including at least one refereed journal article or the equivalent.
- d. The publication of books, book chapters, monographs, monograph chapters, and other academic publications and presentations resulting from applied scholarship and consulting are valued and shall be considered as part of faculty members' body of work. The faculty member shall indicate the review process for these publications. Two publications from this group may substitute for up to one refereed journal article.
 - e. Faculty members shall typically have an average of at least one national or international peer-reviewed presentation at a professional conference each year, or the equivalent.
 - f. Securing extramural funding is one method of supporting research/scholarship and can be one indicator of external validation of the quality of scholarship. Faculty members are encouraged but not required to secure external funding for research/scholarship. Significant grant activity can substitute for some, but not all, journal publications. An externally funded grant(s) totaling \$15,000 or more can substitute for one journal article. Grants totaling \$30,000 or more can substitute for up to two journal articles.
 - g. Most CSP graduates take administrative roles in colleges and universities upon graduation. Many apply to doctoral programs after several years of professional experience in the field. The majority of HIED graduates also take administrative roles in higher education and student affairs and some seek faculty roles in graduate preparation programs. Given the emphasis on professional preparation, scholarly publications co-authored with graduate students are valued, but not always possible and therefore not expected. Conference presentations with students focused on professional issues are often more attainable and are valued.
 - h. Other indicators of research/scholarly effectiveness include, but are not limited to invited presentations at international, national, regional, or state conferences; invited keynote speeches; publications that are substantive but not peer reviewed; research awards; or honors.
 - i. Participation in institutionally-initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes, or alliances/partnerships and in applied scholarship and private consulting may be a component of faculty members' scholarship but shall not substitute for minimum publication expectations.
 - j. Participation in activities to boost research capacity, such as research-oriented learning communities, is valued but not required and shall not substitute for minimum publication expectations.
 - k. For the EPR, faculty members shall provide a 3-5 page research/scholarship narrative in which they provide a reflective analysis of the artifacts included in the dossier. They should clearly explain how they have met stated criteria and standards and how the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) illustrate research/scholarly effectiveness. They shall provide at least four and no more than five performance indicators as detailed in Sections F.4.b-j.

5. Service

- a. Service contributions by faculty members to the department, college, university, and profession are critical to the overall mission of the University. In presenting their records of service, faculty members shall include documentation (e.g., reports authored, letter of support from committee chair) that provides evidence of productive activities and contributions that indicate success on the performance indicators used for evaluation. Examples of service include editorial activities (i.e., editing and/or reviewing the work of others) for professional books, journals, newsletters, conferences, or grants; consultantships and speaking engagements related to the profession; contributions to department, college, university, or professional committees as member or leader; student group advising; and service awards or citations.
 - b. Faculty members shall perform service, either by assignment, election, or nomination every year. Annual service on at least one department committee *and* at least one college or university committee are required for all faculty members. Annual service to the profession (e.g., conference proposal reviewer, service on a committee) prior to the EPR is desired but not required. At least one university service commitment after the EPR is expected (e.g., service on a university committee, university-wide search committee, university award selection committee). At least one service commitment to the profession after the EPR is expected (e.g., committee service, leadership role, proposal reviewer, journal manuscript reviewer [ad hoc or editorial board]).
 - c. External community service (e.g., to support community organizations, projects, and programs) relevant to a faculty member's teaching and/or research/scholarship is valued but not required. With a written agreement from the department chair and endorsement of the dean, external community service related to the discipline may substitute for university service.
 - d. For the EPR, faculty members shall provide a 3-5 page service narrative in which they provide a reflective analysis of the artifacts included in the dossier. They should clearly explain how—appropriate to their level—they have met stated criteria and standards and how the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) illustrate how they have made substantive contributions to the department, college, university, and the profession. They shall provide at least four and no more than five performance indicators as detailed in Sections F.5.a-c.
6. The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost and Dean's Office.

G. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of TTF APR and EPR Materials

1. For each required APR, faculty members shall submit (1) a CV in the BGSU format with activities for the period under review highlighted, (2) a narrative that explains how the teaching, scholarship, and service criteria and standards detailed in Section F have been met, (3) a peer evaluation of teaching, and (4) all student course evaluations for the

period under review. An electronic copy of these materials shall be submitted to the department chair.

2. For the EPR, faculty members shall submit (1) a CV in the BGSU format with activities for the period under review highlighted, (2) Parts I and II of the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy, and (3) all narratives and performance indicators detailed in Section F. Faculty members shall upload all required materials into the designated submission system in accordance with the university's schedule on or before a date specified by the department chair.
3. All submitted materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors.

H. Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

Prior to the department chair conducting an APR, the tenured faculty members shall evaluate the faculty member's progress in assigned duties and submit a review letter to the department chair. The chair will provide a copy of this letter to the faculty member and address any areas of disagreement if they exist in the chair's letter. The chair's letter shall be submitted to the dean.

I. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review

1. Tenure and promotion to associate professor requires demonstrated achievement in teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Promotion to professor requires a cumulative record of sustained teaching effectiveness, sustained scholarly productivity, and sustained and substantial service contributions within and external to BGSU.
2. Candidates for promotion to associate professor and professor shall have regular graduate faculty status with Level I privileges.
3. The following criteria and standards shall be used to evaluate achievement in teaching, research/scholarship, and service. For promotion to professor, the primary focus of evaluation shall be on the period since promotion to associate professor, with particular emphasis on the prior six-year period.
4. Teaching, scholarship, and service narratives in which faculty members effectively describe how they satisfy the criteria and standards detailed in Sections I. 5.-7. and provide necessary context for the 4-5 performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) they provide for review.
5. Teaching
 - a. Teaching effectiveness by faculty members is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the university. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for tenure. Faculty members shall contribute positively to student learning, especially those enrolled in M.A. and Ph.D. courses in the department. They shall develop and maintain an effective, high quality teaching program in all courses.
 - b. A typical teaching load in HESA is two graduate courses both fall and spring semesters. In addition to these courses, all HESA faculty members advise M.A. and

Ph.D. students and serve on preliminary examination and dissertation committees. Faculty should discuss their roles in these activities as part of their overall teaching responsibilities.

- c. Faculty members shall provide a 3-5 page teaching narrative in which they articulate a clearly defined philosophy of teaching and provide a reflective analysis of the artifacts included in the dossier. They should clearly explain how they have met stated criteria and standards and how the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) illustrate teaching effectiveness. For teaching, peer evaluations of teaching (Section I.5.d.) and student course evaluations (Section I.5.e.) are required performance indicators. Faculty shall also provide two or three additional performance indicators as detailed in Section I.5.f. as well as the information required in Sections I.5.g-h.
- d. Tenure-track faculty members shall have at least one peer evaluation of teaching conducted by an associate or full professor each year. Candidates for promotion to professor shall have at least three peer evaluations of teaching conducted by a full professor after promotion to associate professor, at least two within the prior three-year period. The department chair shall collaborate with the faculty member to identify reviewers. For tenure-track faculty members, at least 50% of peer reviews should be conducted by HESA faculty members, but prior to the application for promotion and tenure, at least one should come from outside of HESA. For candidates for promotion to professor, at least one shall be conducted by a HESA faculty member and at least one by a faculty member outside of HESA. Peer evaluations of teaching should provide evidence that the faculty member is an effective teacher. Peer reviewers should attend at least half the class session for 3-credit courses meeting once a week or a full class session for courses meeting 2 or 3 times per week. They shall be provided with the course syllabus, lesson plan, and any assigned readings for the class session and have an opportunity to talk with students without the faculty member present. Reviewers shall be asked to evaluate overall teaching effectiveness (e.g., course structure, classroom management, teaching strategies, advancement of course learning objectives), meet with the faculty member to review the feedback, and submit this letter to the department chair who will provide the faculty member with a copy. These letters are required performance indicators that must be included in the dossier submitted for tenure and/or promotion.
- e. Student course evaluations of teaching provide another indication of the extent to which the faculty member is an effective teacher and that no persistent problems are evident. If any problems were identified in prior student and/or peer evaluations, evidence that they have been addressed and improved upon shall be provided. All course means on the student evaluations for the period under review shall be averaged to calculate an overall mean score. One indicator of teaching effectiveness is an overall mean > 3.75 on a 5-point scale along with generally positive qualitative comments (i.e., preponderance of positive comments and absence of persistent and significant concerns) for tenure-track faculty members and >4.00 for associate professors applying for promotion to full professor. Faculty members shall employ strategies to ensure at least an 80% response rate (indicated on course evaluation report) on course evaluations (e.g., devote class time to complete evaluations).

Applying for tenure and/or promotion, the following two performance indicators related to student course evaluations must be submitted in the dossier:

- (1) A table listing all courses taught by the faculty member that includes: (a) semester of course, (b) course title, (c) evaluation response rate, (d) course mean, (e) course standard deviation, (f) department mean, (g) department standard deviation
 - (2) The full course evaluation report for at least three courses (includes both quantitative ratings and qualitative comments)
- f. Faculty members shall provide at least two other indicators of teaching effectiveness. Other indicators may include, but are not limited to, mid-semester course evaluations, course syllabi, sample assignments, feedback on student assignments (with student information redacted), creation of new classes, service on thesis committees, contributions to curriculum development, and teaching awards. These indicators should provide evidence that learning outcomes are being met, courses are continually reviewed and updated as needed, effective teaching strategies are employed, and stated criteria and standards for tenure have been met.
- g. Faculty members shall serve as advisor to doctoral students (i.e., chair preliminary examination and dissertation committees) and serve on committees chaired by other faculty members when asked by students and when their advising load can accommodate the student. When departmental resources permit, faculty members typically advise 3-4 students active at the proposal and/or dissertation stage and serve on additional preliminary exam, proposal, and dissertation committees for a total of 9-12 committees, on average. Both committee chairs and members should provide timely feedback to students to aid in students' progress toward degree completion. Applying for tenure and promotion to associate professor, faculty members are not required to have chaired a completed dissertation committee but serving as chair of a student at the proposal development stage is highly desirable. Applying for promotion to professor, faculty members shall have chaired completed dissertations at numbers similar to other associate professors. Faculty members shall provide a chart to show the student committees for which they are chair or member and the dates at which students passed program milestones and describe their roles in working with students.

Student Name	Role (Chair or Committee member)	Date of Preliminary Exam Defense	Date of Proposal Defense	Date of Dissertation Defense

- h. Faculty members shall maintain an assigned advising load of M.A. students. Advisors shall provide guidance in course selection, internship performance, professional development, academic progress, etc. The annual number of advisees shall be included on the CV and a description of advising activities shall be included in the teaching narrative or in a teaching artifact.

6. Research/Scholarship

- a. Making significant contributions to the knowledge base of the discipline is critical to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Such contributions are important both in their own right, and because they are an essential qualification for instructing others at a university. Thus, achievement in this area is vital to the department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for tenure. The overall quality of the faculty member's body of scholarship shall be evaluated.
- b. Faculty members shall provide a 3-5 page research/scholarship narrative in which they provide a reflective analysis of the artifacts included in the dossier. They should clearly explain how they have met stated criteria and standards and how the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) illustrate research/scholarly effectiveness. They shall provide at least four and no more than five performance indicators as detailed in Sections I.6.c-m.
- c. The primary evidence of research/scholarly effectiveness is high quality peer reviewed publications. Scholarship shall show evidence of originality and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the setting and the impact of the work on others in the discipline. In considering the quality of publications, the following factors may be taken into account: level of publication outlet (international, national, regional, state), impact (e.g., number of citations), journal acceptance rate, recognition and prestige of publication outlet (e.g., impact factor), and other factors deemed relevant and justified by the faculty member. Additionally, across the body of work, candidates are expected to have published in different journals or outlets. Co-authored publications are equivalent to single author publications but faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of the publication. Candidates should be sole or lead author on some publications, more so for promotion to professor. Documented in press publications are considered published. Publications must be from the period under review.
- d. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor shall typically have:
 - (1) Five refereed journal articles (i.e., unsolicited and masked-review) OR
 - (2) Three refereed journal articles plus peer reviewed book OR
 - (3) Four refereed journal articles plus two of the following: unmasked peer reviewed book chapter, monograph or chapter within a monograph (e.g., *New Directions* series), article in academic magazine (e.g., *About Campus, Change*) appropriate to the discipline (two of one type is acceptable, such as two book chapters)

- e. Candidates for promotion to professor shall typically have an average of one refereed journal article or equivalent (i.e., unsolicited and masked-review) each year for the past six years and shall have at least six refereed journal articles or equivalents since promotion to associate professor. They should also have at least four additional publications (i.e., refereed journal article, peer reviewed book or book chapter, monograph or monograph chapter, article in academic magazine appropriate to the discipline; two of one type is acceptable, such as two book chapters).
- f. In the case of exceptional quality and impact in the discipline, a fewer number of publications may be considered in research/scholarship (e.g., a major book or grant); the candidate must clearly justify exceptions to typical scholarly expectations.
- g. Faculty members shall typically have an average of at least one national or international peer reviewed presentation at a professional conference each year for the past six years and at least six since promotion to associate professor, or the equivalent.
- h. Securing extramural funding is one method of supporting research/scholarship and can be one indicator of external validation of the quality of scholarship. Faculty members are encouraged but not required to secure internal and/or external funding for research/scholarship. An externally funded grant(s) totaling \$15,000 or more can substitute for one journal articles. Grants totaling \$30,000 or more can substitute for up to two journal articles.
- i. Most CSP graduates take administrative roles in colleges and universities upon graduation. Many apply to doctoral programs after several years of professional experience in the field. The majority of HIED graduates also take administrative roles in higher education and student affairs and some seek faculty roles in graduate preparation programs. Given the emphasis on professional preparation, scholarly publications co-authored with graduate students are valued, but not always possible and therefore not expected. Conference presentations with students focused on professional issues are often more attainable and also valued.
- j. Other indicators of research/scholarly effectiveness include, but are not limited to: peer-reviewed and invited presentations at international, national, regional, or state conferences; invited keynote speeches; research grants; publications that are substantive but not peer reviewed; research awards; or honors.
- k. Participation in institutionally-initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes, or alliances/partnerships and in applied scholarship and private consulting may be a component of faculty members' scholarship but shall not substitute for minimum publication expectations.
- l. Participation in activities to boost research capacity, such as research-oriented learning communities, is valued but not required and shall not substitute for minimum publication expectations.
- m. External reviews of scholarly endeavors for all candidates seeking promotion to associate professor or professor are required. The primary purpose for external reviews is to evaluate a candidate's scholarly work in terms of quality, quantity,

impact on the discipline, and national and/or international reputation. Candidates for promotion to professor shall have evidence of a positive national and/or international reputation. Reputation within the discipline shall be judged primarily by external reviewers. The primary focus of evaluation for promotion to professor shall be on activities since promotion to associate professor, with particular emphasis on the prior six-year period. Sustained and regular engagement in the scholarship of the profession, or the equivalent, is expected. Significant gaps in scholarly productivity (e.g., during service as a faculty administrator or significant editorial responsibilities) shall be explained by the candidate. The process for selecting external reviewers will follow procedures outlined by the Provost's office.

7. Service

- a. Service contributions by faculty members to the department, college, university, and profession are critical to the overall mission of the University. In presenting their records of service, faculty members shall include documentation that provides evidence of productive activities and contributions that indicate success on performance indicators used for evaluation. Examples of service include editorial activities (i.e., editing and/or reviewing the work of others) for professional books, journals, newsletters, conferences, or grants; consultantships and speaking engagements related to the profession; contributions to department, college, university, or professional committees as member or leader; student group advising; and service awards or citations.
- b. Faculty members shall provide a 3-5 page service narrative in which they provide a reflective analysis of the artifacts included in the dossier. They should clearly explain how—appropriate to their level—they have met stated criteria and standards and how the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) illustrate how they have made substantive contributions to the department, college, university, and the profession. They shall provide at least four and no more than five performance indicators as listed in Section I.7.c.-e.
- c. Faculty members shall have performed substantive service to the department, college, university, and profession. Service may be by assignment, election, or nomination. Faculty members shall serve on at least two committees (department, college, and/or university) per year and document their contributions. Candidates for promotion to associate professor shall have a documented record of annual contributions to department and college and/or university committees. Some service to the profession is expected (e.g., regular reviewer of conference proposals, occasional reviewer of journal manuscripts, conference session chair). In addition to the foregoing standards, candidates for promotion to professor shall have played key leadership roles in at least three committees in the department, college, university and/or profession, or the equivalent. External candidates being considered for appointment as associate professor or professor shall provide evidence of contributions to the profession and potential contributions to the department, college, and university.
- d. External community service (e.g., to support community organizations, projects, and programs) relevant to a faculty member's teaching and/or research/scholarship is

valued but not required. With a written agreement from the department chair, external community service related to the discipline may substitute for university service.

J. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials

1. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure shall meet with the department chair to review relevant policies and procedures. Faculty members are also encouraged to attend promotion and tenure workshops sponsored by the college and to seek assistance in preparing the materials from the faculty mentor, department chair, and other faculty members prior to submission of the credentials to the department chair for the unit level review.
2. Faculty members shall submit materials electronically into the designated submission system in accordance with the university's schedule on or before a date specified by the department chair.
3. Materials for tenure and/or promotion uploaded into the system shall include:
 - a. Parts I and II of the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy (or appropriate document)
 - b. CV in the BGSU format with all activities for the period under review highlighted (i.e., time period on the tenure track for promotion to associate professor; time period as associate professor for promotion to professor)
 - c. Copy of letter from Graduate College sent when graduate faculty status was awarded
 - d. Narratives for teaching, research/scholarship, and service and at least four and no more than five supporting performance indicators for each area (including those required for teaching); performance indicators shall support the criteria and standards for promotion detailed in Section I
 - e. For faculty members applying for tenure and promotion to associate professor, all prior APRs and the EPR from BGSU
 - f. External review is required of all candidates for promotion and/or tenure and will adhere to all college and university policies. The chair shall upload these letters and reviewers' CVs after candidates submit their dossiers.
4. All submitted materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors.
5. The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost and Dean's Office.

Approved by the Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs

Department Chair Mamea Elison Date 01/11/2018

Reviewed by the Dean [Signature] Date 1/15/18

concur do not concur for the following reason(s):

Reviewed by the SVPAA/Provost John M. Frick Date 1/16/18
 concur do not concur for the following reason(s)

R:\DeanBalzer\VPFASISuccessor Contract\Implementation of CBA 2\CBA Committees\Labor-Management\RTP Template Part II - FINAL - approved by BGSU-FA and Provost October 24, 2016.docx